

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6-9 and 14-20 are amended herein. Claims 4 and 5 are canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-3, 5-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Pub. 2001/0044337 (“*Rowe*”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite additional features. For example, claim 1 now recites first and second game terminals equipped, respectively, with first and second terminal interfaces that selectively switch signals from a remote central processor so that the processor may concurrently run different games on multiple game terminals. Support for the amendment may be found in the original specification. *See, e.g.* U.S. Application Pub. 2005/0049048 at par. 0039 and FIG. 3.

Rowe doesn’t anticipate claim 1 because *Rowe* doesn’t teach a system having multiple game terminals, each lacking a local processor, that rely on a remote central processor to execute game code for different game types. As a result, *Rowe* doesn’t teach a system having multiple game terminals that each rely on a local terminal interface to receive signals from the remote central processor and selectively switch those signals to different components of the game terminal, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action on p. 3 asserts that *Rowe* teaches a switch “configured to communicate with each game component housed within the housing of each terminal” and for support cites to *Rowe* at FIG. 3. The Office Action states that in FIG. 3, “all input modules are in communication with the game system”.

In FIG. 3, *Rowe* shows a portable gaming device (PGD) 24, several hardware devices linked to PGD 24, and several game service interfaces contained within an interface block 106. But there is no switch shown in FIG. 3, and there is no teaching in *Rowe* for selectively switching signals between a remote processor and components within a game terminal, such as a game terminal display, a game terminal player interface, and a game terminal monetary interface, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the “game service interfaces 106 are generated on the display screen 102 by a

microprocessor ... within the PGD 24.” *Rowe* at par. 0036. It is evident that *Rowe* teaches a local processor in the PGD. *Rowe* therefore doesn’t anticipate game terminals configured without local processors that rely a remote central processor, as recited in claim 1. Applicants request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 1 recites: “*the first game terminal and the second game terminal each lacking a local processor and relying on and sharing the central processor.*”

Rowe doesn’t teach first and second game terminals that lack processors and rely on and share a central processor. Nevertheless, the Office Action on pages 3-4 asserts that in *Rowe*, “each of the terminals are lacking processors” and for support cites to *Rowe* at pars. 0059 and 0061. The Office Action, however, is equating a processor with a memory that stores code executable by the processor.

Rowe at par. 0059 states that “PGD 24 is adapted to receive and process data”, and that the code “is not resident at the PGD.” Furthermore, *Rowe* at 0061 states that “the PGD 24 includes a processor” and that “gaming code is not stored directly at the PGD.” Thus, *Rowe* teaches PGDs equipped with local processors, but does not mention the above-quoted feature recited in claim 1. Applicants request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3 and 6 depend from claim 1. For the same reasons presented above, applicants request that the §102 rejections of claims 2, 3 and 6 be withdrawn.

Claim 7 recites limitations similar to those in claim 1. In view of these distinctive features, applicants request that the §102 rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-13 each depend from claim 7, and for this reason applicants request that the §102 rejections of these claims also be withdrawn.

Claim 15 has also been amended to recite limitations similar to those in claim 1. In view of these distinctive features, applicants request that the §102 rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claim 17 is dependent on claim 15 and, thus, Applicants submit that *Rowe* does not anticipate claim 17 for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over *Rowe* in view of U.S. Patent 4,621,814 ("*Stepan*"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Stepan was cited only for teachings directed to placement of two gaming devices within the same housing. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of *Rowe* to place multiple gaming devices within a common housing to reduce space requirements.

Applicants reassert here the foregoing arguments for patentability of claim 7 over *Rowe*. In view of the dependency of claim 14 on claim 7, applicants request that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the combination of *Rowe* and *Stepan* is impractical, because *Rowe* teaches gaming machines in the form of separate PGDs, which are hand-held, portable gaming devices (*Rowe* at 0025). In light of this teaching, a skilled artisan would not be encouraged to confine multiple hand-held devices into a stationary cabinet as taught by *Stepan*. See *Stepan* at FIG. 1.

Moreover, in the invention recited in claim 14, the gaming terminals are located remotely from and share a common processor and control module. *Stepan* teaches putting two independent machines in a common cabinet (*Stepan* at 2:37-38 and 4:4-5). The combination of *Rowe* and *Stepan* would put two processor-equipped gaming machines within a single cabinet, and therefore fall short of teaching the invention of claim 14.

Conclusion

Based on the above, all pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date is earnestly requested. If prosecution of this application can be assisted by telephone, the Examiner may call the undersigned attorney at (510) 663-1100.

Applicant has authorized the USPTO to charge fees for an RCE and a petition for a 2-month extension of time. If any additional fees are due, please charge such additional fees to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. IGT1P277).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/ John F. Griffith /
John F. Griffith
Registration No. 44,137

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100